ED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMAR PATENT APPLICATION Group Art Unit Examiner: Ellen M. McAvoy Inventor(s): Corner et al. 09 843,166 Atty. Dkt. Appln. No.: 0280189 Series Code ↑ Serial No. ↑ M# Client Ref Appln. Title: Filed: April 27, 2001 **Lubricant Compositions** Hon. Commissioner of Patents 0 9 200 Washington, D.C. 20231 OCT 1 5 2002 Sir: REPLY/AMENDMENT/LETTER Date: October 9, 2002 TC 1700 This is a reply/amendment/letter in the above-identified application and includes the herewith attachment of same date and subject which is incorporated hereinto by reference and the signature below is treated as the signature to the attachment in absence of a signature thereto. FEE REQUIREMENTS FOR CLAIMS AS AMENDED 1. Small Entity claim For B & C A. X NOT made Claims Highest number Present Extra Large/Small Entity Additional Fee Code See Required B. Withdrawn remaining after previously paid for Fee Separate Paper C. \square made herewith amendment Lg/Sm (Pat-256) D. _ made previously 2. Total Effective Claims **minus 20 0 x \$18/\$9 =+ \$0103/203 9 ***minus 102/202 3. Independent Claims 3 0 x \$84/\$42 =+ \$0 4. If amendment enters proper multiple dependent claim(s) into this application for first + \$280/\$140 = time (leave blank if this is a reissue application)..... + \$0 104/204 2.2.3.4 5. Original due Date: August 9, 2002 6. Petition is hereby made to extend the original due 115/215 (1 mo) \$110/\$55 = 116/216 + \$400 date to cover the date this response is filed for which the (2 mos) \$400/\$200 = 117/217 requisite fee is attached \$920/\$460 = (3 mos) 118/218 (4 mos) \$1,440/\$720= 128/228 \$1,960/\$980= (5 mos) 7. Enter any previous extension fee paid since above original due date and subtract - \$0 **Extension Fee** + \$400 9. If Terminal Disclaimer attached, add Rule 20(d) official fee + \$110/\$55 + \$0 148/248 126 + \$180 + \$0 126 or if Rule 97(d) Request add + \$180

16. *If the entry in this space is less than entry in next space, the "Present Extra" result is "0".

17. **If the "Highest number previously paid for" in this space is less than 20, write "20" in this space.

11. After-Final Request Fee per rules 129(a) and 17(r)

12. No. of additional inventions for examination per Rule 129(b).....

13. Request for Continued Examination (RCE)

18. ***If the "Highest number previously paid for" in this space is less than 3, write "3" in this space.

PLEASE CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

146/246 149/249

1179/1279

10/10/2002 TBESHAH1 00000054 033975 09843166 400,00 CH

CHARGE Deposit Account No. 03-3975 090128 0280189 Our Order No.

+ \$740/370

+ \$740/370

x \$740/370 ea

TOTAL FEE =

CHARGE STATEMENT: The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee specifically authorized hereafter, or any missing or insufficient fee(s) filed, or asserted to be

filed, or which should have been filed herewith or concerning any paper filed hereafter, and which may be required under Rules 16-18 (missing or insufficiencies only) now or hereafter relative to this application and the resulting Official Document under Rule 20, or credit any overpayment, to our Accounting/Order Nos. shown above, for which purpose a duplicate copy of this sheet is attached.

This CHARGE STATEMENT does not authorize charge of the issue fee until/unless an issue fee transmittal sheet is filed.

Query: Is appeal deadline now? If so, file Notice of Appeals separately.

+ \$0

+ \$0

+ \$0

+ \$0

\$400

Pillsbury Winthrop LLP Intellectual Property Group

By Atty:

Richard A. Steinberg

Reg. No.

26,588

McLean, VA 22102 Tel: (703) 905-2000

P.O. Box 10500

14. Petition fee for

15.

01 FC:116

Sig:

hard astenby

Fax: Tel:

(703) 905-2500 (703) 905-2039

Atty/Sec: RAS/kmh

NOTE: File this cover sheet in duplicate with PTO receipt (PAT-103A) and attachments

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re PATENT APPLICATION OF

Confirmation No. 8587

Corner et al.

Group Art Unit: 1764

Application Serial No. 09/843,166

Examiner: Ellen M. McAvoy

Filed: April 27, 2001

Title: LUBRICANT COMPOSITIONS

OCT 1 5 2002

October 9, 2002

RESPONSE TO FINAL REJECTION

Hon. Commissioner of Patents Washington, D.C. 20231 (Box AF)

Sir:

OCT 0 9 2002

In response to the Office Action dated May 9, 2002, please enter the following remarks in the above-identified application.

REMARKS

With removal of the final rejection, reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-11 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over McGraw (US 4,851,144) and Ward (US RE 33,658), considered separately, or in combination with Smalheer et al. These rejections are respectively traversed for the following reasons.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must demonstrate: 1) a suggestion to combine or modify the cited references to obtain the claimed invention; 2) a reasonable expectation of a successful combination of the references; and 3) that the cited art teaches all claim limitations of the pending application. See: MPEP §2143. The Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because there has been no showing of a suggestion to modify the cited references to obtain the claimed invention.